

Belvedere: September 23, 2004
Jerry Butler

Corte Madera: **TO:** Transportation Authority of Marin Commissioners
Melissa Gill

Fairfax: **RE:** TPLUS Toolkit for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) and Pedestrian-Oriented Design (PeD) – Draft Principles, Benefits, Issues, and Barriers – Agenda Item 7
Lew Tremaine

Larkspur: Dear Commissioners:
Joan Lundstrom

Mill Valley: The Transportation Planning and Land Use Solutions Advisory Committee (TPLUS Advisory Committee), an advisory committee to the Transportation Authority of Marin staff, has met several times over the past few months to develop Marin-specific principles for TAM's TPLUS program, and particularly as a starting point for the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) and Pedestrian-Oriented Design (PeD) toolkit. The intent of the toolkit is to provide recommendations and resources for policies, implementation, and "best practices" for TOD and PeD in Marin County.
Dick Swanson

Novato:
Pat Eklund

Ross:
Tom Byrnes

San Anselmo:
Peter Breen

San Rafael:
Al Boro

Sausalito:
Amy Belser

Tiburon:
Alice Fredericks

County of Marin:
Susan Adams
Hal Brown
Steve Kinsey
Cynthia Murray
Annette Rose

The development of the principles has included a review of TOD- and PeD-related goals contained in existing local and countywide planning documents, as well as a summary of benefits that could be obtained from implementing TOD/PeD in Marin County. In addition, a number of barriers and issues to implementing TOD/PeD in Marin have been identified. Both documents are critical building blocks for the successful development of a useful toolkit. While the "Principles" identify the toolkit's primary aims for Marin County, the identification of Marin-specific "Barriers" is critical to provide the toolkit with focus on the most critical issues that need addressing in order to achieve the TOD/PeD principles.

Input on principles, benefits, issues, and barriers was also received from the Marin Consortium for Workforce Housing, representatives from several environmental advocacy groups, and from planning staff of local jurisdictions, affordable housing advocates, and housing developers.

Recommendation

At this point, staff requests that the TAM Board review and comment on the presented TOD/PeD Principles & Benefits and Issues & Barriers documents. After receiving the Board's comments and suggested refinements, the documents will be revised and presented again at the Board's October meeting, with a request for acceptance of the final TOD/PeD Principles & Benefits and Issues & Barriers documents.

After acceptance of the TOD/PeD Principles & Benefits and Issues & Barriers documents by the TAM Board in October, staff will work with the TPLUS Advisory Committee on the development of the toolkit fundamentals, which

will include recommendations for TOD/PeD planning strategies, "best practices," and implementation steps. A complete draft of the TOD/PeD Toolkit will be presented to the TAM Board for review and comment by March 2005.

Respectfully Submitted,

Craig Tackabery
Executive Director

Attachments:

1. Draft Principles & Benefits Document
2. Draft Issues & Barriers Document
3. Summary of Input from Marin stakeholders

Vision for Marin’s Transportation and Land Use Solutions (T-PLUS)

Envision a future for Marin County with a **safe, efficient multi-modal transportation system and a broad range of housing choices, including housing which is affordable to the full range of our workforce and community**, with a **compact development footprint** and **minimal environmental impacts**.

Key Principles

1. Create a well-connected multimodal transportation system and network of places that reduces the reliance on single-occupancy automobiles and integrates pedestrians, bi-cycles, and transit.

2. Target new development to areas that are already developed, particularly locations that can be effectively served by transit.

3. Create compact community places with a diverse mix of uses through infill, redevelopment, and reuse of developable property.

4. Provide Marin residents with quality housing choices that address their broad range of household types and incomes.

5. Design a network of human-scaled places that fit the distinct character of Marin’s communities and environment.

6. Coordinate land use- and transportation-related planning efforts and decision making in Marin to promote the vision and principles of the Marin TPLUS program.

Principles	Related Local Goals	Benefits
<p>Principle 1: Create a well-connected multimodal transportation system and network of community places that reduce the reliance on automobiles, particularly single-occupancy motor vehicles, and integrate pedestrians, bicycles, and transit.</p> <p><i>Marin’s existing transportation system is primarily focused on mobility of the private automobile. This has led to fewer public transit alternatives and to roadways that are congested with automobiles and poorly accommodate pedestrians and bicycles.</i> (re-phrased from Countywide Plan, Built Environment - ‘Key Trends and Issues’, page 3-4)</p> <p>Key components of a multi-modal transportation system are: appropriately sized, continuous sidewalks and pedestrian walkways; an interconnected network of streets, with well designed intersections; an interconnected bicycle network; and a seamless, interconnected transit system that provides attractive service not only for commuters but also to other destinations where frequent activities of daily life occur.</p> <p>The design and use (including a determination of appropriate speed) of individual streets in the multimodal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ A diversified, cost-effective and resource efficient transportation network provides mobility for all users. <i>(DRAFT San Rafael General Plan, Circulation Element)</i>▪ Increase opportunities for the use of bicycle and pedestrian paths as viable alternatives to vehicular transportation, and to interconnect neighborhoods, commercial centers, schools, parks and other key activity centers <i>(Goal IV.2 DRAFT Corte Madera General Plan, Circulation Element)</i>▪ Encourage attractive alternatives to the use of single-occupant automobiles <i>(Goal 5, Larkspur General Plan, Circulation Element)</i>▪ To promote an integrated transportation system, including the preservation and enhancement of transit, in order that residents and visitors can efficiently and conveniently transfer and connect between different transportation modes. <i>(Goal C-G, Tiburon General Plan, Circulation Element)</i>▪ Design automobile use areas to fit the character of the community and comfortably accommodate travel by pedestrians and bicyclists <i>(DES-5 - Countywide Plan)</i>▪ Provide a range of transportation options that meets the needs of residents, businesses, and travelers <i>(TP</i>	<p>Multi-modal streets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Enhance mobility by encouraging and supporting walking, bicycling, and transit use as competitive alternatives to driving.▪ Increase “person-trip” capacity of the existing street system.▪ Provide enhancements to bicycle circulation and safety such as bike lanes and paths <p>Pedestrian-oriented design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Creates a walkable and human-scaled environment that encourages walking, bicycling, and transit use.▪ Encourages transit use by providing safe and direct connections between transit stops and destinations.▪ Enhances all transportation choices because virtually all trips involve walking to begin and end the trip.▪ Maximizes the access to existing land uses.▪ Create safe routes and access to schools <p>Walkable environments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Help to improve the physical health of a community.▪ Discourage crime by making streets more active pro-

Principles	Related Local Goals	Benefits
transportation system will differ depending on adjacent land uses and the function of the street within the road-way network. At a minimum, streets need to provide ap-propriate access, safety, and mobility for pedestrians in-cluding the disabled, seniors, and youth, and—wherever possible—should provide a quality environment for those strolling, shopping, resting, and taking part in public life.	<p>the needs of residents, businesses, and travelers (<i>TR-1 Countywide Plan</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Expand bicycle and pedestrian facilities and access in and between neighborhoods, employment centers, shopping areas, schools, and recreational sites (<i>TR-2 Countywide Plan</i>)▪ Provide efficient, affordable public transportation service countywide that meets the needs of everyone, including the elderly, disabled, and transit-dependent (<i>TR-3 Countywide Plan</i>)	<p>viding “additional eyes on the street.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Improve air quality by reducing the number of trips by single-occupancy vehicles.▪ Improve access for seniors and disabled persons. <p>Interconnected street networks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Provide shorter routes for pedestrians and bicyclists.▪ Distribute traffic allowing limited right-of-ways to serve multiple modes.▪ Reduce the number of short distance trips that have to use already congested arterial roads.

Principles	Related Local Goals	Benefits
<p>Principle 2: Target new development to areas that are already developed, particularly locations that can be effectively served by transit.</p> <p><i>Marin places strong emphasis on protecting natural resources and scenic settings. Today, only 11% of Marin is developed. The majority of the remaining potentially developable land is located in the boundaries of existing communities. The appropriate scale and geographic distribution of new land uses and major transportation infrastructure are key to protecting the County’s environmental assets while maintaining the County’s economic vitality and social equity goals.</i></p> <p>Mixed-use developments that concentrate jobs and housing should be targeted to appropriate areas in existing downtowns, village and neighborhood centers, along major transit corridors, and in potential commuter rail station areas. Here development can capitalize on existing infrastructure and services, such as roads, utilities, transit, and public facilities. Diversification of land uses in existing retail or employment areas offers the opportunity to create mixed-use districts and centers allowing people to work, shop, be entertained, and engage in a variety of activities in one location and thus reduce the number of trips they take.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Creative infill development and redevelopment takes maximum advantage of our existing resources. <i>(DRAFT San Rafael General Plan, Economic Vitality Element)</i>▪ Keep Novato relatively compact in physical size by establishing firm urban limit lines <i>(Goal 3, Novato General Plan)</i>▪ Actively facilitate the creation of new affordable housing in Downtown Tiburon and on identified underutilized sites throughout the Tiburon Housing Element Area that have existing infrastructure and few physical constraints. Continue to encourage and legalize secondary dwelling units in appropriate locations <i>(Goal H-C, DRAFT Tiburon Housing Element)</i>▪ Focus intensive development at nodes <i>(CD-2.4 - Countywide Plan)</i>▪ Concentrate new medium to high-intensity land uses to infill areas where services can be provided <i>(CD-6 - Countywide Plan)</i>▪ New building should occur in a compact form in already developed locations whenever feasible <i>(DES-3 - Countywide Plan)</i>	<p>Focusing development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Promotes the vitality of business districts and neighborhoods by directing investment into existing areas.▪ Supports better transit service by concentrating jobs and housing, creating a larger transit customer base, which justifies more frequent transit service throughout the day and into the evening. This attracts additional customers, particularly those sensitive to time and convenience of service.▪ Infill and redevelopment can often utilize existing sewer and water systems, police and fire services, schools, etc., thus reducing the need to make significant new public investments.

Principles	Related Local Goals	Benefits
<p>Principle 3: Create compact community places with a diverse mix of uses through infill, redevelopment, and reuse of developable property.</p> <p><i>Past development of retail and office space in Marin has primarily resulted in low-density, single-use places, each surrounded by surface parking. Such buildings create places that are incompatible with Marin’s heritage and character, and generate an automobile trip for almost every activity of shoppers and workers.</i> (rephrased from Countywide Plan, Built Environment - ‘Key Trends and Issues’, page 3-3)</p> <p>Places with a diverse mix of uses and compact development, such as traditional downtowns have long been popular with pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users because they offer a multitude of destinations within convenient distance. Where mixed-use areas are located close to residential neighborhoods, they can reduce vehicle trips as walking is opportune. Similarly, mixed-use areas in proximity of employment centers allow workers to walk for daily errands shopping, dining, or entertainment and thereby reduce the number of overall vehicular trips. Housing provided as part of mixed-use developments provides proximity to goods and services, and potentially jobs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Use our land efficiently to meet housing needs and to implement “smart” and sustainable development principles (<i>HS-3 - Countywide Plan and Objective 2, San Anselmo Housing Element + Objective 2, DRAFT Mill Valley Housing Element</i>)▪ Keep Novato relatively compact in physical size by establishing firm urban limit lines (<i>Goal 3, Novato General Plan</i>)▪ To support and encourage mixed-use development in Downtown, especially in order to provide affordable housing opportunities (<i>Recommended Goal, DRAFT Tiburon Downtown Element</i>)▪ Facilitate employment opportunities that minimize the need for automobile trips...in addition to mixed use development strategies (<i>CD-3 - Countywide Plan</i>)▪ Locate mixed-use, medium to higher density development in appropriate locations along transit corridors (<i>DES-2 Countywide Plan</i>)	<p>Compact and infill development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Slows down the process of land consumption for new development.▪ Supports walking, ridesharing, cycling, and transit use by enabling people using these modes to make other trips conveniently. Consequently, vehicle trips and dependence on cars are reduced.▪ Generates off-peak transit use because trips to and from mixed-use developments occur throughout the day and into the evening.▪ Adds to the economic vitality of business districts by increasing the diversity of retail and commercial services offered. Also, mixed-use districts provide a convenient mix of goods and services to employees during the day and residents in the evening. As a result many businesses have a steady flow of customers all day.▪ Contributes to neighborhood livability by providing activities within easy walking distance of neighborhoods. With these choices available, residents tend to walk more in their neighborhoods, increasing the area’s safety, friendliness, and livability.

Principles	Related Local Goals	Benefits
<p>Principle 4: Provide Marin residents with quality housing choices that address their broad range of household types and incomes.</p> <p><i>Historically, investment in housing in Marin has focused on the construction of low-density and expensive singe-family houses, often inadequately connected to older neighborhoods and downtowns. This development has consumed relatively large amounts of land for a small number of residents, is affordable only to high-income households, and generates a significant proportion of vehicle trips countywide.</i> (rephrased from Countywide Plan, Built Environment - ‘Key Trends and Issues’, page 3-4)</p> <p>Broadening the range of housing choices in Marin, with particular focus on affordability and serving a variety of household types, can contribute to the reduction of vehicular trips by allowing more people who work in Marin to live in Marin. Mixed-use development strengthens economic vitality of an area by bringing in additional consumers. Providing workforce housing in proximity of well-served transit lines will further reduce the number of automobile trips and also advances social equity by reducing the need for car ownership among a population that can least afford it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Use our land efficiently to meet housing needs and to implement “smart” and sustainable development principles (<i>HS-3 - Countywide Plan, Objective 2 - San Anselmo Housing Element, Objective 2 - DRAFT Mill Valley Housing Element</i>)▪ Encourage a diverse demographic (especially age, family, and income) mix in Larkspur (<i>Goal 3, Larkspur General Plan, Land Use Element</i>)▪ Provide for a variety of housing opportunities through new construction and maintenance of existing housing for an economically and socially diverse population, while preserving the character of the community (<i>Goal 8, Novato General Plan</i>)▪ It is the goal of San Rafael to have an adequate housing supply and mix that matches the needs of people of all ages, income levels, and special requirements. (<i>Goal 4, DRAFT San Rafael General Plan, Housing Element</i>)▪ Provide a mix of housing (<i>CD-2.1 - Countywide Plan</i>)▪ Locate housing near activity centers (<i>CD-2.3 - Countywide Plan</i>)▪ Concentrate commercial and medium to high-density residential development near activity centers that can be served efficiently by public transit and alternate transportation modes (<i>DES-2.1 Countywide Plan</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Transit-oriented development can increase opportunities for affordable housing as it is very attractive for low-income households who can reduce their spending on automobile transportation (14 to 22% of household income).▪ Affordable housing provided in the vicinity of transit prevents people without cars from being isolated.▪ Affordable housing ensures that the workforce is able to live in close proximity to work, increasing the employee pool available for businesses, and reducing the length of trips▪ Affordable housing provides local housing for public safety workers, increasing their ability to provide services in an emergency.

Principles	Related Local Goals	Benefits
<p>Principle 5: Design a network of human-scaled places that fit the distinct character of Marin’s communities and environment.</p> <p><i>A primary challenge for new housing and other development, including transportation facilities, in Marin County is achieving compatibility with the distinct character of existing communities and the surrounding natural environment.</i> (rephrased from County-wide Plan, Built Environment, page 3-94)</p> <p>In order to complement existing community and environmental character it is important that design of new development—its site plan, layout, architectural composition, building materials—is in keeping with the best examples found in the immediate surrounding. Equal attention will ideally be given to the construction of new transportation facilities or the enhancement of existing roads to be multi-modal. The careful detailing of the streetscape increases the economic viability of a shop-lined street, creates new vital public places, or beautifies a neighborhood.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Utilize design as a tool to create outstanding residential neighborhood character through use of innovative, quality architecture and site planning (<i>Goal V.1 DRAFT Corte Madera General Plan, Community Design Element</i>)▪ To preserve existing neighborhood character and identity (<i>Recommended Goal, DRAFT Tiburon General Plan Land Use Element</i>)▪ Maintain the character, diversity and long term viability of the City's residential neighborhoods by establishing residential land use districts that reflect the predominant land use, scale, density and intensity of existing development (<i>Land Use Objective LU-1.0, Sausalito General Plan</i>)▪ Assure that all new or significantly remodeled structures be designed to respect existing land forms and natural site features and to maintain the balance between open space and buildings (<i>Community Design Objective CD-2.0, Sausalito General Plan</i>)▪ Perpetuate the unique character of each community, including the essential design characteristics that make each place attractive and livable. (<i>DES-1 - Countywide Plan</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Well-designed and appropriately scaled buildings are more likely to be supported by the community.▪ Enhancing existing transportation facilities for multi-modal use provides opportunities for streetscape beautification specific to the locale.▪ Introducing pedestrian-oriented streetscape elements makes larger roadways more compatible with communities of small and medium scale and the natural environment.

Principles	Related Local Goals	Benefits
<p>Principle 6: Coordinate land use- and transportation-related planning efforts and decision making in Marin to promote the vision and principles of the Marin TPLUS program.</p> <p><i>As for all counties in California, land use and transportation decisions in Marin are made by a broad variety of cities, towns, agencies, the County, and the State. The National and State Park facilities, watershed facilities, and regional transportation that come to and pass through Marin add further complexity.</i></p> <p>If local jurisdictions and the County improve the coordination of their land use and transportation decision making it will improve the ability to achieve a single-occupant automobile trip-reducing mix and intensity of land uses and multi-modal transportation network. This is critical because most of the remaining developable land in Marin is located in the County's cities and towns, while most decisions about the future transportation system are made on a countywide and regional level. In addition, coordination between cities can also improve the effectiveness of incremental improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists within the local road network.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Coordinate planning with other jurisdictions (<i>CD-4 - Countywide Plan</i>)▪ Coordinate urban fringe planning (<i>CD-6.1 - Countywide Plan</i>)▪ Work together to achieve the County's housing goals (<i>HS-1 - Countywide Plan</i>)▪ Coordinate regional transportation/housing activities - Use our land efficiently to meet housing needs and to implement “smart” and sustainable development principles (<i>HS-3.13 - Countywide Plan</i>)▪ Coordinate transportation, economic, and land use planning to help provide effective transit services which reduce dependence on the single-occupant automobile (<i>Goal 9, Novato General Plan</i>)▪ To address regional issues, such as transportation, schools, and water, through coordination with neighboring cities, the county, and other governmental entities (<i>Recommended Land Use Goal, DRAFT Tiburon General Plan</i>)	<p>Coordinated land use and transportation can result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Optimized use of natural, infrastructure, and fiscal resources.▪ Improved quality of life and livability for all communities in the County.▪ Improved air quality throughout the region.

Note: The following plans were referenced in compiling the “Related Local Goals” section of this document:

- DRAFT Marin Countywide Plan (February 2004)
- DRAFT San Rafael General Plan (February 2004)
- Tiburon General Plan (1989) and DRAFT General Plan Element Issues Papers (2003/2004)
- DRAFT San Anselmo Housing Element (2003)
- DRAFT Corte Madera General Plan Framework (2003)
- DRAFT Mill Valley Housing Element (2002)
- Sausalito General Plan (1997)
- Novato General Plan (1996)
- Larkspur General Plan (1990)

The above compilation focused on relatively recent planning documents as these best reflect jurisdictions’ current view of land use and transportation related issues. More related goals may be found in General Plans of other jurisdictions such as Fairfax, Ross, and Belvedere or in general plan elements other than the referenced Housing Elements.

Issues and Barriers for Marin's Transportation and Land Use Solutions (T-PLUS)

There are four major issue areas to address in the TOD/PeD toolkit. These issue areas each contain multiple barriers that can apply to more than one TOD/PeD principle. The toolkit should be oriented to overcoming the Issues/Barriers identified here and through further discussion with the Advisory Committee and others.

Issue Areas

1. Local and Countywide Policy and Institutional Issues
2. Funding and Fiscal Issues
3. Physical and Environmental Issues
4. Community Concerns Regarding Change

Issue Area 1: <i>Local and Countywide Policies and Institutions</i>	Identified Issues/Barriers	Relevant Principles
<p>Some land use and transportation policies at the local and county level do not support TOD/PeD and the development of a network of multi-modal streets. Development regulations do not allow more intense, residential and mixed-use developments, and local traffic and transportation policies often have high parking standards and strict policies with respect to existing levels of vehicular service and additional traffic on local streets. Local project review and public involvement procedures further limit the implementation of TOD/PeD and the development of workforce housing.</p> <p><i>The toolkit can address these issues by presenting educational materials that illustrate and explain the benefits of TOD/PeD, by suggesting local and countywide planning approaches that would further TOD/PeD, and by developing model land use, parking, and transportation standards to be implemented by local jurisdictions.</i></p>	<p>Conflicting goals of local and regional planning agencies (for example, local vs. regional transportation issues) as well as lack of coordination of goals and policies within the County hamper creation of a network of places that is desired according to goals contained in most community plans; <i>for example, lack of coordinated transportation or land use planning for corridors shared by several communities.</i></p>	1,2,3,4,6
	<p>Local and State Policies (with regard to traffic, engineering, and street design) that do not allow for the development of a multi-modal street network.</p>	1
	<p>Local development regulations that do not support intensification of development (including zoning, use restrictions, parking requirements, and density, height, FAR, setback regulations); <i>for example, the combination of higher parking requirements and lower height limits can make it infeasible to develop housing in downtowns.</i></p>	2,3,
	<p>Most jurisdictions rely on project-by-project discretionary review, including requiring CEQA review for smaller projects, which increases uncertainty and cost, rather than undertaking more “forward” planning, such as Specific Plans.</p>	1, 2, 3, 4
	<p>Restrictive local congestion policies regarding existing levels of service, while TOD sites are typically in highly trafficked corridors.</p>	2,3

Issue Area 1: <i>Local and Countywide Policies and Institutions</i>	Identified Issues/Barriers	Relevant Principles
	Transit needs to be more focused on intra-Marin trips, which constitute the lion's share of all trips.	1, 2
	Housing is needed at various income levels, not just affordable housing.	4
	Lack of workforce housing is a major contributor to difficulties with retaining or attracting desired employers.	4
	Need for more collaborative public planning processes that involve all interests at an early stage to make sure all issues are addressed	4,6
	Lack of adequate tools to TOD/PeD projects promoting alternative modes. Can make developers responsible for all of the potential impacts of a more traditional development, PLUS the amenities that encourage alternative modes; <i>for example parking reductions that are monitored for performance or alternatives to level of service as a measure of congestion.</i>	6
	Success of project approval process can be strongly influenced by developer's approach to public involvement; <i>for example: efforts to hear neighborhood concerns from the beginning and then throughout the design and approvals process improves ability to gain support.</i>	2, 3, 4

Issue Area 2: <i>Funding and Fiscal Issues</i>	Identified Issues/Barriers	Relevant Principles
<p>Funding for transit infrastructure and operations, and community planning efforts, as well as the financial implications of some development policies constrain the possibilities available to Marin County and local jurisdictions.</p> <p>Cost of development is high in Marin County, making mixed-use, workforce housing, and affordable development a challenge.</p>	Low level of funding available for infrastructure construction and maintenance, and transit operations.	1,2,3,6
	Land and construction costs make financing workforce housing difficult.	4
	Most TOD/PeD development opportunities are small infill sites, which are more difficult to develop in terms of design and economic feasibility.	2
	Local agencies lack funds to conduct planning work and coordinate amongst agencies.	6

Issue Area 2: <i>Funding and Fiscal Issues</i>	Identified Issues/Barriers	Relevant Principles
<p><i>The toolkit can address these issues by developing an implementation strategy that details various approaches to project funding and methods to improve the ability of Marin projects and planning efforts to compete for limited regional, state, and federal funds.</i></p> <p><i>“Best Practices” contained in the toolkit can help to reduce project design and review costs.</i></p>	Cost-effectiveness of transit in short-term for a long-term strategy.	6
	Lack of staffing capacity can contribute to extended approvals process, which increases the cost of development.	3

Issue Area 3: <i>Physical and Environmental Issues</i>	Identified Issues/Barriers	Relevant Principles
<p>Much of Marin County is highly valued and protected open space, yet opportunities for infill and revitalization still exist in areas that are already developed. Perceptions of existing conditions are that they create constraints that cannot be overcome by new development.</p> <p><i>The toolkit can address these issues by presenting benefits and tradeoffs inherent in TOD/PeD, the development of a multi-modal, interconnected network of streets, and by outlining a decision-making process based on facts and evaluation criteria that reflect community values.</i></p>	Road rights-of-way and physical constraints to multi-modal streets.	1,5
	Highway 101 creates a physical barrier, which makes it difficult to achieve an interconnected transportation system, particularly for pedestrians and bicyclists.	1
	Lack of an interconnected street network and lack of alternatives or parallel routes to Highway 101, which then requires even short local trips to be made by freeway.	1
	Need to manage regional tourist traffic/access to open space effectively.	6
	Benefits of TOD/PeD are not clearly understood, for example congestion-reducing impact on local trips and ability to better balance jobs & housing by locating both housing and jobs near transit.	1, 2, 3, 6

Issue Area 4: <i>Community Concerns Regarding Change</i>	Identified Issues/Barriers	Relevant Principles
People react to proposed development and change at a very personal level. They have real concerns about traffic, economic, environmental, and other benefits and impacts. While TOD/PeD will bring	Negative community attitudes towards alternative transportation modes, especially high capacity transit such as rail improvements, given perceptions that transit is growth inducing and has significant environmental impacts.	1

Issue Area 4: Community Concerns Regarding Change	Identified Issues/Barriers	Relevant Principles
<p>change to Marin County, there are a variety of misunderstandings and misconceptions that are barriers to implementation</p> <p><i>The toolkit can address these issues by including an education aspect that can be broadened through public outreach and implementation efforts.</i></p>	<p>Community concerns about personal safety of pedestrians, especially children walking to school alone (both a traffic safety and a personal safety concern).</p>	<p>1</p>
	<p>Community opposition to new development, redevelopment, and land use intensification or growth due to perceived extent of traffic and environmental impacts and perception that County is already “built-out”.</p>	<p>2,3,4,5,6</p>
	<p>Concern that additional interconnected streets will result in “cut through”-traffic, as local streets become an alternative to the over-congested freeway.</p>	<p>1</p>
	<p>Particular concern with “workforce housing” that there can be no guarantee that local workers will live there, and that housing will simply be more commuter housing that will increase traffic.</p>	<p>1, 5</p>
	<p>Concern that non-residential development in residential neighborhoods will draw traffic and parking problems from outside the neighborhood.</p>	<p>3</p>
	<p>Perception that high demand for single-family detached housing, and particularly demand for such housing on large lots, inhibits development of multi-family housing and TOD.</p>	<p>2,3,4</p>
	<p>Approvals process allows neighborhood concerns focused on an individual project to override existing policies that represent a broader community-based consensus, especially for workforce housing.</p>	<p>2,3,4,6</p>
	<p>Perception that affordable housing will negatively impact the neighborhood and property values.</p>	<p>4</p>
	<p>Some in community do not feel a “responsibility” to meeting regional and countywide goals, such as jobs-housing balance, workforce housing, change in transportation mode, and the fundamental link between these goals and particular lifestyle choices.</p>	<p>6</p>
	<p>Senior Housing projects are often uncontroversial, but may not result in the production of any affordable units.</p>	<p>4</p>

COMMUNITY DESIGN + ARCHITECTURE

Region • City • Neighborhood • Building

Memorandum

September 4, 2004

To: Carey Lando, Transportation Authority of Marin

From: Thomas Kronmeyer and Phil Erickson, Community Design + Architecture
Shanti Breznau, Strategic Economics

Total of 8 pages

Re: **Marin TPLUS Project (CD+A No. 0313)** —*Summary of Input from Interviews and Focus Group Meetings*

This memorandum provides a summary of the input that has been received from outreach efforts undertaken by the consultants and TAM staff, in addition to the input from the TPLUS Advisory Committee. The input was provided through a series of phone interviews of developers, and two focus group meetings (one with the Marin Consortium for Workforce Housing and one with representatives of Marin environmental groups).

Summary of Interviews with Planning Staff, Housing Advocates, and Developers¹

Summary of Comments from Staff

Interviewed Staff:

Ron Gerber, Redevelopment Director, City of Novato

Stephanie Smith-Lovett, ED Director, City of San Rafael

Issues:

1. Mixed Use: It is an unreasonable expectation to develop mixed use on every in-fill site, no matter how small. It is difficult to attract small grocery stores for integration into mixed-use projects (i.e. typical depth of chain grocery 150ft depth & mixed use of 40 ft depth).
2. Affordable Housing:
 - a. Affordable rents defined by AMI are practically market rate, which makes its utility questionable. Marin has need for market-rate housing at various income-levels, not just affordable housing.
 - b. Developers face onerous inclusionary requirements if they desire additional density. Developers can get a 25% density bonus for free with the state requirement, however beyond this threshold, the city requires 50% affordability, which developers say is not feasible (more typical requirement is 20%).

¹ conducted by Strategic Economics in July of 2004

3. Parking: San Rafael's parking ratio for its downtown is 1:1, regardless of the unit type at <900 square feet. Developers indicate that from a market perspective shared parking does not work at parking ratios of equal to or less than 1:1, except for student housing in 700-square foot studios or 1-bedroom apartments.
4. Height Restrictions: Height limits of 36 – 42 feet are too low to fit parking and the 4 stories needed to make the project feasible (3 story projects are not feasible).
5. Regional Traffic: Highway 101 congestion can cause major back-ups in the downtown, and Sir Francis Drake is very slow. Citizens want no further degradation of intersections and are therefore not sympathetic toward further density in downtown, particularly as they view all units as equal and equally traffic inducing. The soon available traffic model for downtown San Rafael will make it even more difficult to build new development.

Suggestions:

1. Sustainability: Expand the Marin definition of sustainability - educate people about the connection between favorably viewed topics like solar power, electric cars, open space preservation, and the important link between land use and transportation (transit) planning.
2. Workforce Housing: Present arguments for the implementation of projects that provide workforce housing (service workers, agricultural workers).
3. Opportunity Sites:
 - a. Un-used school sites: As the population ages, the need for school capacity is decreasing, which creates the opportunity sites for affordable housing for teachers and others. If not used for building in the near-term the sites could be leased or retained by the school district as a future asset.
 - b. County land: There is a substantial amount of county land around the Civic Center that, if the County wants to promote certain types of development, could be used for additional development.
4. Building Advocacy Groups: Aiming the toolkit towards advocates by providing them with useful tools for working with the public, i.e. fact sheets, etc.
5. Trip Generation by Unit Type: Education about the differences in vehicle ownership and trip generation with respect to different types of units would be helpful.

Summary of Comments from Affordable Housing Developers & Housing Advocates

Affordable Housing Developers

Betty Pagett, Director of Education & Advocacy Ecumenical Association for Housing

Katy Crystalis, Development Consultant for Affordable Housing & Housing Advocate

Housing Advocate

Elizabeth Moodie, Citizen Advocate, Mill Valley Interfaith Housing Committee

David Kunhardt, Citizen Advocate, Corte Madera

Issues:

1. TOD is often defined narrowly as being around stations, rather than along corridors, which is a more appropriate approach for Marin. Transit should also be more focused on intra-Marin trips.
2. Height Limits: Height limits in Marin are too low. A minimum of at least 3 stories (38 feet) is needed. Feasibility often requires 3 stories over parking.
3. Misconceptions re. Car Ownership and Traffic Generation: Citizens view all units as equal in car ownership and traffic generation. This issue is a significant barrier to development.
4. Small in-fill projects: The financing of small projects is increasingly difficult, which presents a problem given that most remaining opportunity sites in Marin are small in-fill sites.
5. Staff Knowledge: Marin has a large number of jurisdictions relative to its population (12 jurisdictions of 250K people) and there is great variation in how knowledgeable these cities are about TOD and development, in general. This variation increases the burden on pre-development throughout the county.

Suggestions:

1. Suggestions for Toolkit:
 - a. Trip generation by unit type: Education about the differences in vehicle ownership and trip generation with respect to different types of units as well as appropriate parking requirements.
 - b. Techniques are needed for building a case for the development of small, 1-6 unit projects. This should include the explanation of relative higher costs for smaller projects.
 - c. Providing assistance to existing advocacy groups in educating and standing in front of commissions, etc would be most useful. Direct campaigns to commissioners/councils are the most effective way of influencing policy.
 - d. Examples of good suburban in-fill projects at appropriate densities could be a helpful tool in discussions with people and commissions. Non-profit developers don't need design techniques or examples with the exception of mixed-use prototypes.
 - e. Numbers specific to affordable housing in the Bay Area would also be helpful, i.e. numbers with respect to actual usage of public transit generated by different uses, and the relationship to the level of transit service. Sources on any provided handouts should be carefully cited and dated to satisfy the sophistication of Marin residents.

- f. “Best practices” are not needed.
 - g. A brief white paper aimed at Staff that explains the difficulty of developing smaller sites, in-fill, and redevelopment sites (vs. Greenfield) could be a helpful tool
2. Policy: Well thought out housing elements and land use policies are crucial.

Summary of Comments from Market-rate Housing Developers

Market-rate Developers

Michael Hooper, Developer, Campus Properties (Current project at Larkspur Landing)

Will Thomas, Developer, Thomas Dorfman (Past multi-family, current Loch Lomand project in San Rafael on San Pedro Rd.)

Rob Wainwright, Developer, Shea Homes (current project at Meadow Park in Novato)

Issues:

1. Community resistance to in-fill development within existing neighborhoods is the major barrier.
2. Discretionary Approvals: Projects are typically not approved as of right, but rather on a discretionary approvals basis. There appears to be a lack of sufficient staff, which impedes a timely approval of projects. Also, Councils frequently shift opinion on development projects, thus reducing the level of certainty necessary for development to move forward.
3. CEQA Interpretation: CEQA or cities’ interpretations thereof: Cities are very conservative when it comes to interpreting CEQA. This often results in requiring full EIRs, where negative declarations would typically be expected.
4. Parking Ratios & Height Limits: Existing parking ratios and height limits are among the most important development standards that constitute barriers to development.
5. Highway 101: Highway 101 congestion and on-ramp back up is a major issue for Marin residents. Marin towns were not built on an urban model, which makes them difficult to retrofit.
6. Large Projects: City Staff are overburdened by larger projects with respect to both personnel capacity and expertise in current development trends and building details. Opinions by consultants hired by cities often do not hold up at the time when final decisions are issued by staff.
7. Affordable Housing Requirements: Both lack of consistency in inclusionary requirements across different jurisdictions, and the frequently needed customizing of the requirements add to the difficulty of housing development. Also, sufficiently onerous inclusionary policies become a subterfuge for no growth positions.

Suggestions:

1. New Types of Demand Should be Acknowledged: There is major new demand for townhomes from seniors and “move-downs”. It should be possible to plan and build such projects in Marin.
2. Preliminary Tests of Proposals: In Larkspur, developers can go directly to the City Council to present a (draft) proposal in order to get a first reaction. Given the uncertainty of the approvals process, this is a helpful opportunity for developers.
3. Parking Ratios and Height Limits should be reasonably coordinated.
4. EIRs: Create “Program EIRs” as a step between General Plan and project EIRs. Avoid Specific Plan EIRs (Pleasant Hill Specific Plan EIR is negative example).
5. Funding Incentives: Matching fund sources for cities are always very helpful.
6. HIP Cycle: Developers prefer the bundling of funds afforded by 3-year cycle for HIP funds. This larger amount could be used to address larger problems, i.e. the widening of 101 through San Rafael, to alleviate traffic at off ramps and in towns. Small projects would waste the funds as they will not address major problems.
7. Traffic Generation and Development: Develop information with respect to the relationship between traffic generation and new development. Most traffic is drive-through from north of Marin. The more people live in Marin as compared to further up north, the lesser will be the impact on the transportation network. Analysis and explanation of this would be helpful.
8. Audience for Toolkit Materials: Educational materials should aim to convince the “undecideds” in the County, not the environmentalists.

Focus Group Meeting #1: Marin Consortium for Workforce Housing

Following are key comment on issues and barriers to transit- and pedestrian-oriented development made by the members of the Marin Consortium for Workforce Housing. Comments are organized by issue area:

Issue Area #1: Local and Countywide Policy and Institutional Issues

1. There was wide agreement that the implementation of policies during project approvals is the key barrier to production of workforce housing in Marin and rather than a lack of policies that support workforce housing.
2. Members of the group pointed to the fact that some development projects seem to succeed in the approvals and hearing process while others perish there.
3. Projects whose developer involved residents of the area, the Chamber of Commerce, City staff and the larger community in a consistent and timely manner tended to be more successful than those for which developers engaged in a truncated community involvement process.

Issue Area #2: Funding and Fiscal Issues

1. Stated that Specific Plans are rarely used in Marin County as implementation tool for proposed or desired development and thought that the use of Specific Plans could create the benefit of a smoother implementation process.

Issue Area #3: Physical and Environmental Issues

1. The group expressed that many Marin residents didn't believe that TOD can help to reduce congestion experienced during regular daytime trips, such as trips to the grocery store. In this context the group felt that emphasis should be given to the argument that housing close to transit is likely to reduce commute trips
2. Confirmed that "density will bring undesirable people to Marin" is a notion that runs strong among residents.
3. Confirmed that "all transit is growth inducing" is a strong view among Marin residents.
4. Suggested to emphasize in TOD/PeD toolkit that good transportation/transit is not growth inducing.

Issue Area #4: Community Concerns Regarding Change

1. The group explained that relative dense senior housing projects do not tend to spark a lot of opposition. Also pointed out that many senior projects in Marin do not produce affordable units because of their relative large unit size and the general affluence of residents who are looking to retire in Marin.

Other Comments unrelated to particular issue areas:

1. Members of the MCWH challenged the notion that Marin is increasingly becoming an employment center. Instead the group cited problems with retaining vital businesses based on lack of affordable housing choices for the workforce of these businesses.
2. The group suggested that overall vehicle trips in Marin will increase in spite of low population growth due to the lack of affordable housing in the County.
3. The group voiced some concern over focusing development in "already developed areas" as spelled out in Principle #2, as this could potentially be interpreted as precluding development at a site like St. Vincent.
4. Pointed out that "air-rights" development over existing commercial buildings is economically difficult to achieve, and therefore often advanced as a solution by groups or individuals with a no-growth attitude.
5. In regards to the grant limits of the Marin TLC and HIP programs, the group confirmed how difficult and cumbersome the use of Federal dollars is for local jurisdictions. The recent return of funds for a bridge project in Petaluma was presented as an example.

Focus Group Meeting #2: Environmental Interest Groups

The following people attended this meeting:

David Schonbrunn (TRANSDEF); *Marge Macris* (Marin Chapter of the Sierra Club); *Karen Nygren* (Marin Chapter of the Sierra Club); *Don Wilhelm* (Marin Conservation League).

The participant's comments are organized by topic area:

Growth and Carrying Capacity of Transportation System

1. It was suggested that job growth and not population growth is the driving force behind the increasing congestion on Marin's Streets and Highways. This points to the importance of job growth projections in the Countywide Plan.
2. Growth beyond the capacity of that provided by the existing multi-modal transportation system leads to congestion, particularly as Marin's roadways have reached the limit of their expandability to accommodate more vehicular trips.
3. Stressed the importance of the concept of Carrying Capacity of developable land within the County (balance between number of people working and living in the County and the provided transportation system). If growth is to occur, putting more people into less vehicles should be the goal.
4. Pointed out that the concept of Carrying Capacity was also important with respect to commercial development projected in the Countywide Plan. Expressed doubt that 10 million square feet of additional commercial space were realistic in light of transportation issues.
5. Suggestion to add Carrying Capacity to TPLUS Principles and to consider the trips generated by HIP-related development.

Transit Service and Transit-oriented Development

1. The group expressed that many Marin residents didn't believe that higher density housing near transit would reduce congestion.
2. Two participants expressed doubts that a "TOD Lifestyle" could be achieved in absence of a transit system that provides 15 minutes headways not only during peak hours but also for the remainder of the day. The importance of future transit improvements was stressed as vital in the context of furthering TOD.
3. Emphasized that elected officials like to see adequate transit service in place prior to implementing changes to parking ratios and land use policies near transit (chicken and egg issue), and that a mismatch between available transit services and implementation of TOD projects could result in inadequate parking and added trips.
4. Expressed belief that high demand in Marin for detached, single family homes on large lots constitutes a barrier to TOD.

TPLUS Program and TLC/HIP Grants

1. Suggested to be clear about why the TPLUS Program was created and what its aims are.
2. Suggested that TAM be clear with jurisdictions that HIP program would not spread funds equally among communities countywide, but rather go to those few jurisdictions able to approve projects meeting the density and transit headway requirements associated with the program.
3. Proposed to include parking ratios as evaluation criterion for projects submitted under the HIP program (and reward projects with lower parking ratios).
4. Suggested to contact landowners of identified opportunity sites to alert them to the opportunities provided by the HIP program and to actively convince them of the advantages of pursuing TOD development on their properties. Proposed to conduct a workshop with property owners to this end.

TPLUS Principles

1. It was suggested to add a discussion to the TPLUS Principles that addresses the need for improving previously degraded environmental features (i.e. creeks, wetlands) in already developed areas as part of future redevelopment projects.
2. Proposed to state a clear case for TPLUS Program and state principles such that they fundamentally challenge current attitudes toward growth and TOD in the County.